UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,024	06/15/2001	Kumar Bhaskaran	YO9-99-314	7837

30743	7590	02/24/2006

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
FRANCIS, MARK P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-7* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment filed November 14, 2005.

2.   Claims 1 and 3-7 remain pending.

3.   Per applicants' request, claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended and claim 2 has

been cancelled.

Response to Amendments

4.   The rejection of claim 3 for having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation

"the creation" is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

6.   A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burke. (U.S.

Pat 6,789,252)

With respect to claim 7, Burke discloses A BDML (Business Decision Markup

Language) processor(Col 34:20-67, "…the integration framework facilitates data

transfer using XML gateways..." comprising: a syntax processor that checks the syntax

correctness and syntax consistency within an individual and between different

documents written in BDML; (Col 23:17-50,"...a content validation method...the

Compliance method...")

a logic processor that checks logical consistency between different documents written in

BDML, in terms of the business objectives, constraints, assumptions, data, and

underlying model among the different documents; (Col 20:35-67,Col 21:1-8, "...The

compare compares a first business object definition...")

and a knowledge-based processor including a knowledge base of business decisions,

common choices for their decision support models and commercially available decision

support systems, the knowledge-based processor providing suggestions for a set of

BDML documents to improve consistency using the knowledge base.(Col 23:41-67,

"...be automatically prepped from reusable specification chunks...",Col 24:15-40,

"...derives a new specification from an existing specification...")

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Burke (U.S. Pat 6,789,252) in view Tilden. (U.S. Pub 2002/0129345)

Regarding claim 1,

Burke discloses a computer implemented system analysis and design method(Col 5:31-

40, "…a method and system fro creating…") for use in a complex business environment

characterized by a set of tightly linked business processes comprising the steps of:

capturing in a framework a world view(Col 6: 9-50, "…provides a shared vision…") of a

business decision and/or a business application software system, wherein a world view

is defined by business objectives, constraints(Col 26:34-47, "…Business Rules as

Object Definition…"), assumptions, data, and underlying model used in business

decision and/or the application software system; and using the framework to specify and

document each business decision(Col 2:57-67, "…in making decisions…") and/or

business application software system in the complex environment. (Col 5:1-67, "can

build business software applications…object definition framework is provided for

managing business object definitions…",Col 18:2-15,"…adds meaning to the group of

ingrediential objects…", Col 16:46-67, "…take the form of models…")

but does not disclose that a BDML (Business Decision Markup Language) is used to

implement the framework for specifying the world view of a business decision and/or a

business application software system;

Tilden discloses that a BDML (Business Decision Markup Language) is used to implement the framework for specifying the world view of a business decision and/or a business application software system;(Col 2:0027-0029, "...intermediate tier implements the business logic and middleware framework...includes an XML document store...") in an analogous system for the purpose of providing scripting capability in a distributed object-oriented software system including a rules-based scripting language typically designed to capitalize on the capabilities offered by a GenericServer XML configuration file approach.(Tilden:Col 1:0007)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a Business Decision Markup Language to implement the framework for identifying the world view of a business decision to Burke's invention using the teachings of Tilden.

The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide scripting capability in a distributed object-oriented software system including a rules-based scripting language typically designed to capitalize on the capabilities offered by a GenericServer XML configuration file approach.(Tilden: Col 1:0007)

With respect to claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Burke discloses that the BDML is used for creation and maintenance of a knowledge base of

business decisions and processes within an organization. (Col 3:1-16, "...can be captured and applied...")

With respect to claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Burke discloses that the BDML is used for the publication of the functional specification of a business application software system, the world view of a technical research paper in the area of business decisions and its findings. (Col 9:1-20, "...exchanging definitions and specifications...")

With respect to claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Burke discloses that the BDML is machine-readable by a BDML processor as well as readable by human users so that it can be used for systematic documentation of business objectives, constraints, assumptions, data, and underlying model in business processes and/or application software systems. (Col 34:20-67, "...facilitates data transfer using XML gateways...")

With respect to claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Burke discloses that the BDML supports XML (eXtensible Markup Language) based standards for business to business exchanges. (Col 34:20-67, "...to create a seamless gateway between the business object definition system and existing enterprise systems...")

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments filed on November 14, 2005 have been fully considered

with respect to claims 1-6 but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to claim 7, Applicant essentially argues that Burke does not include a

BDML.

In response the examiner disagrees, notes Col 34:50-67 and Col 35:1-20, it is here that

Burke discloses an integration framework that is suitable for use with the Business

Object Definition System uses XML format that consists of an XML content document

and its schema. Burke also teaches that during the data transfer, data is automatically

validated against a document type definition document during the data import process

into the business object definition system. Thus, Burke does include a BDML.

In addition, the applicant also argues that Burke does not teach the correctness and

consistency of human and machine-readable documents created in BDML.

In response, the Examiner disagrees, notes Col 35:10-45, it is here that Burke defines

an XML bridge the automates the creation of bidirectional mapping between a fixed

record flat file and a DTD conformant XML file. A DTD is updated, used as input to

generate the XTBuilder COBOL Program, which is then compiled into an executable

module on a target platform. Therefore, Burke does disclose the correctness and

consistency of human and machine-readable documents created in BDML.

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until afterthe end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mark P. Francis whose telephone number is (571)272-

7956. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)272-3719. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100